



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/675,399

09/29/2000

Carl Bilicska

Bilicska 3-2

9208

7590 12/21/2007
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 8910
RESTON, VA 20195

EXAMINER

MAHMOUDI, HASSAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2165

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/21/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/675,399

Applicant(s)

BILICSKA ET AL.

Examiner

Tony Mahmoudi

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 June 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to the Appeal Brief filed on 20-September-2007, an Appeal Conference was held on Wednesday, 28-November-2007, during which the conferees recommended the re-opening of prosecution via a new grounds of rejection. This Office Action is therefore made Non-Final.

2. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 20-September-2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).\

3. Claims 1-14 are presently pending in the application, of which, claims 1 and 9 are presented in independent form.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112 - Withdrawn

4. Per the Advisory Action issued by the Examiner on 15-February-2007, the previous rejections made under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph are overcome and the rejection is therefore, withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101 - Withdrawn

5. Applicant's arguments presented in the Appeal Brief regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 have been fully considered and are deemed persuasive. The rejection is therefore, withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gudbjartsson et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0027519 A1; hereinafter, **Gudbjartsson**) in view of Bates et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0044843 A1; hereinafter, **Bates**.)

As to claim 1, **Gudbjartsson** teaches an automated (see Abstract and see paragraph 3) authentication handling system (see paragraphs 8, 10, and 31) for use by clients (see paragraphs 29 and 31) on a network (see paragraphs 29, 31 and 34) comprising:

an authentication server (see paragraph 31, where “authentication server” is read on “system server 101 authenticates the user”) operable to establish a two-way (see paragraphs 8, 29 and 30) trusted communication link (see “secure environment” in paragraphs 7 and 9; and see paragraphs 29 and 30, where “trusted” is the security provided by the ‘firewall 202’) with an authenticated user (see paragraphs 29, 31, 34, and 48.)

Gudbjartsson does not teach access for the authenticated user to a list of application servers associated with a client identifier.

Bates teaches a multi-user computer system (see Abstract), in which he teaches access for the authenticated user to a list of application servers associated with a client identifier (see paragraph 47, where it is taught: “this data may be provided as an individual list of particular servers authorized for each user”, and see paragraph 53, where it is taught: “upon authentication of the user's identity and password, the helper PC accesses the database to obtain the list of servers authorized for access by that user.” In this paragraph, “a list of application servers associated with a client identifier” is read on “list of servers authorized for access by the user”, as determined by authenticating the user via user’s “identity and password”, which is read on the “client identifier.”

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified **Gudbjartsson** by the teaching of **Bates**, because including a link for access by an authenticated user to a list of application servers,

would enable the system to provide secure means for authenticated clients to access desired web sites hosted by various servers throughout a network. For example, the system can provide a directory of partner service servers to the users. As taught by **Bates** in paragraph 54, “once the user has input a running list of servers, the user inputs a command to the helper PC to implement the connection.”

As to claim 2, **Gudbjartsson** as modified teaches wherein the authentication server (see **Gudbjartsson**, paragraph 31, where “authentication server” is read on “system server 101 authenticates the user”) includes:

an identification engine configured to maintain collections of session assignments, each of the session assignment collections being associated with the client identifier (see **Gudbjartsson**, paragraphs 6-8, where “session assignment” is read on “security zones or domains”).

As to claim 3, **Gudbjartsson** as modified teaches wherein said identification engine is operable to receive client identifiers from said clients (see **Gudbjartsson**, paragraph 56) to establish authenticated users (see **Gudbjartsson**, paragraph 37) and responsive thereto to provide a user interface to access said application servers according to said associated session assignments (see **Gudbjartsson**, paragraph 29. Also see **Bates**, paragraph 53, where he teaches, “upon authentication of the user's identity and password, the helper PC accesses the database to obtain the list of servers authorized for access by that user.”)

As to claims 4 and 5, Gudbjartsson as modified teaches wherein the authentication server (see Gudbjartsson, paragraph 31, where “authentication server” is read on “system server 101 authenticates the user”) includes:

a communication initiator engine (see Gudbjartsson, paragraph 39) configured to establish the trusted communication link between the authenticated users and an application server (see Gudbjartsson, “secure environment” in paragraphs 7 and 9; and see paragraphs 29 and 30, where “trusted” is the security provided by the ‘firewall 202’.)

As to claim 6, Gudbjartsson as modified still does not teach wherein the session assignments include data fields selected from the group consisting of session timeout and application access level.

Bates, on the other hand, teaches wherein the session assignments include data fields selected from the group consisting of session timeout (see “timed slots” in paragraphs 16 and 28) and application access level (see “level of access” in paragraph 60.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Gudbjartsson as modified, by the further teaching of Bates, because doing so would enable the system to control assignment of sessions based on predefined time periods or based on the level of a user’s access. Doing so would, as taught by Bates, “preclude a user from gaining unauthorized access by use of action commands” (see paragraph 60.)

As to claim 7, Gudbjartsson as modified teaches wherein the client identifier includes a user id (see Gudbjartsson, paragraph 35, where “user id” is read on “username”) and password (see Gudbjartsson, paragraphs 50-54. Also see Bates, paragraph 53, where “user identity and password” is taught.)

As to claim 8, Gudbjartsson as modified teaches wherein the authentication server (see Gudbjartsson, paragraph 31, where “authentication server” is read on “system server 101 authenticates the user”) includes a processor under the control of software (see “central processing unit” in Gudbjartsson, paragraph 25) to:

receive an authentication signal from the client (see Gudbjartsson, paragraph 56);
provide an application access interface to the client in response to the authentication signal (see providing access to a list of servers upon authentication, in Bates, paragraph 53);
and

establish the trusted communication link between the client and an application server selected from the application access interface (see Gudbjartsson, “secure environment” in paragraphs 7 and 9; and see paragraphs 29 and 30, where “trusted” is the security provided by the ‘firewall 202’.)

As to claim 9, Gudbjartsson teaches a method for automatically authenticating a client (see paragraphs 10 and 31) comprising the steps of:

providing an authentication server (see paragraph 31, where “authentication server” is read on “system server 101 authenticates the user”);

Art Unit: 2165

identifying clients to access an application servers by the authentication server (see paragraphs 7 and 35); and

establishing a two-way (see paragraphs 8, 29 and 30) trusted communication link (see “secure environment” in paragraphs 7 and 9; and see paragraphs 29 and 30, where “trusted” is the security provided by the ‘firewall 202’) with an authenticated client (see paragraphs 29, 31, 34, and 48.)

Gudbjartsson does not teach a plurality of application servers and access by an authenticated user to a plurality of application servers associated with a client identifier.

For the above teaching, the applicant is directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above, in view of the teachings of **Bates**.

As to claim 10, **Gudbjartsson** as modified teaches wherein the identifying step includes: providing session parameters for each of the identified clients for at least one of the application servers (see **Gudbjartsson**, paragraphs 6-8.)

As to claim 11, **Gudbjartsson** as modified teaches wherein the identifying step includes: providing a user interface to the identified clients for accessing the application servers (see **Gudbjartsson**, paragraphs 35 and 50-54.)

As to claim 12, **Gudbjartsson** as modified teaches wherein said establishing step includes:

using said session parameters (see Gudbjartsson, paragraphs 6-8) to establish said trusted communication link (see Gudbjartsson, “secure environment” in paragraphs 7 and 9; and see paragraphs 29 and 30, where “trusted” is the security provided by the ‘firewall 202’.)

As to claim 13, Gudbjartsson as modified teaches wherein the user interface includes a listing of application servers (see Bates, paragraphs 47, 53 and 54) and the establishing step is initiated following a selection of an application server by a user from the user interface (see Bates, paragraphs 49 and 55.)

As to claim 14, Gudbjartsson as modified teaches the method further comprising a plurality of application servers (see Bates, paragraphs 47, 53 and 54) connected to the network (see Bates, paragraph 45), each requiring authentication for access (see Gudbjartsson, paragraphs 37 and 48, and see Bates, paragraphs 47 and 53.)

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed in the Appeal Brief filed on 20-September-2007 with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds for rejection.

Art Unit: 2165

Conclusion

9. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tony Mahmoudi whose telephone number is (571) 272-4078. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 08:00 am to 04:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christian Chace, can be reached at (571) 272-4190.

December 18, 2007

/Tony Mahmoudi/

Tony Mahmoudi
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2165
Tel. (571) 272-4078
Fax (571) 273-4078

tony.mahmoudi@uspto.gov